Minimax Robust Decentralized Detection in Parallel Sensor Networks

Gökhan Gül, *Member, IEEE*

Technische Universität Darmstadt, 64283, Darmstadt, Germany

E-mail: ggul@spg.tu-darmstadt.de

arXiv:1703.07670v1 [cs.IT] 22 Mar 2017

Abstract

Minimax robust decentralized detection is studied for parallel sensor networks. Random variables corresponding to sensor observations are assumed to follow a distribution function, which belongs to an uncertainty class. It has been proven that, for some uncertainty classes, if all probability distributions are absolutely continuous with respect to a common measure, the joint stochastic boundedness property, which is the fundamental rule for the derivations in Veerevalli's work, does not hold. This raises a natural question whether minimax robust decentralized detection is possible if the uncertainty classes do not own this property. The answer to this question has been shown to be positive, which leads to a generalization of the work of Veerevalli. Moreover, due to a direct consequence of Tsitsiklis's work, quantization functions at the sensors are not required to be monotone. For the proposed model, some specific examples have been provided and possible generalizations have been discussed.

Index Terms

Robustness, Decentralized Detection, Data Fusion, Sensor Networks, Minimax Hypothesis Testing.

I. Introduction

In simple binary hypothesis testing the design of optimum decision rules requires the exact knowledge of the conditional probability distributions under each hypothesis. However, in practice, complete knowledge of the observation statistics is often not available, such as occurs with the presence of outliers or due to model mismatch. In these cases, a reasonable approach is to represent each hypothesis by a set or class of distributions and determine the optimum decision rule via minimizing the worst case performance. Such tests are called minimax robust tests and

they often have the property of guaranteeing a certain level of detection performance irrespective of the actual state of the observation statistics. Because of this property, minimax robust tests are often essential for the design of systems that have to function reliably in harsh environments or in environments which cannot be modeled accurately [1].

The first and probably the most fundamental work in robust hypothesis testing was developed by Huber in 1965 [2]. He showed that the minimax robust test for the ϵ-contaminated classes of distributions and the uncertainty classes with respect to the total variation distance were clipped likelihood ratio tests, where the likelihood ratio was obtained between so called least favorable distributions from the respective uncertainty classes. In his follow-up work, Huber extended the class of distributions to five, from where the same conclusions could be made [3]. The most general classes of distributions for which the clipped likelihood ratio is the minimax robust test are the two alternating capacities, published by Huber and Strassen [4].

In addition to robustness, another important aspect is to include multiple decision makers (physical sensors) into the decision making process. In many practical applications, such as radar, wireless communication, or seismology, more than a single sensor is available and it is well known that if the events of interest are independent, the system error probability decreases exponentially with the number of sensors [5]. Although the benefits of robust distributed detection are obvious, progress made since 1980's has been insignificant [6]. The earliest study in this field was conducted by Geroniotis, who considered a distributed detection network without a fusion center (DDN-WoF) for a fixed sample size and a sequential discrete time robust detection for two sensors [7]. In [8], Geraniotis and Chau studied the robustness of distributed detection network with a fusion center (DDN-WF) and sequential data fusion where the emphasis was on the selection of robust fusion rules. In their recent work [9], Geraniotis and Chau generalized most of their results presented in [8].

All Huber's classes of distributions satisfy joint stochastic boundedness property. Based on this observation it was proven in [10] that for jointly stochastically bounded classes of distributions, there exist least favorable distributions for DDN-WF if the individual sensors employ robust tests. Moreover, the authors formalized necessary conditions that need to be satisfied by the cost assignment procedure for DDN-WoF. The results derived in [10] generalize the DDN-WoF-results of Geroniotis [7] to a network of more than two sensors and to more general cost functions. Furthermore, the results of [10] also generalizes the DDN-WF-results of Geraniotis and Chau [8], [9] to non-Bayesian formulation, non-binary decisions, non-identical sensor decisions and

non-asymptotic case, both in terms of the number of sensors as well as the number of observations. Recent studies in robust decentralized detection consider different network topologies, for instance tandem sensor networks, where asymptotic analysis is of great interest [11], [12] and application of earlier results to scenarios with constraints such as power [13], communication rate [14], or local optimality [15].

In this paper, a more comprehensive solution to minimax robust decentralized detection problem is provided. The network topology is parallel with a finite number of sensors and a fusion center. Each sensor in the sensor network collects a finite number of samples characterizing either the null or the alternative hypothesis and gives a decision which is possibly multi-level. The proposed scheme includes the work of Veerevalli et. al. [10] as a special case since in our work the two conditions: $1)$ joint stochastic boundedness property and $2)$ monotone sensor quantization functions are not necessarily required. Moreover, generalizations to Neyman-Pearson detection, repeated observations and different network topologies are also discussed.

The organization of this paper is as follows. In Section II, the motivation and the problem definition is given. In Section III the theory behind the solution of minimax robust decentralized detection problem is introduced. In Section IV specific examples are given. In Section V possible generalizations of the theory is discussed, and finally in Section VI the paper is concluded.

II. Motivation and Problem Definition

Binary minimax decentralized detection is studied for parallel sensor networks as illustrated in Figure 1. The hypotheses $\mathcal{H}_0$ and $\mathcal{H}_1$ are associated with the probability measures P_0 and P_1, which have the density functions p_0 and p_1, respectively. Here, and in the following sections every probability measure e.g. $P[\cdot]$ will be associated with its distribution function $P(\cdot)$ i.e. $P(y) = P[Y \leq y]$ for the random variable Y and the observation y. The detailed structure of the sensor network will be presented after stating the motivation. The following remark, and lemmas will be used in the rest of the paper.

Remark II.1. Let X and Y be two random variables defined on the same measurable space $(\Omega, \mathcal{A})$, having cumulative distribution functions P_X and P_Y, respectively. X is called stochastically larger than Y, i.e. $X \succeq Y$, if $P_Y(x) \geq P_X(x)$ for all x.

Lemma II.1. *For every non-decreasing function* υ, $X \succeq Y \iff \upsilon(X) \succeq \upsilon(Y)$, *hence* $X \succeq Y \iff \mathrm{E}[\upsilon(X)] \geq \mathrm{E}[\upsilon(Y)]$.

Proof of Lemma II.1 is simple and can be found for example in [16, pp. 4-5].

Lemma II.2. *Let X_1, X_2, Y_1 and Y_2 be four random variables on $(\Omega, \mathcal{A})$, out of which X_1 and X_2, and Y_1 and Y_2 are independent. If $X_1 \succeq Y_1$ and $X_2 \succeq Y_2$, then $X_1 + X_2 \succeq Y_1 + Y_2$.*

Proof. From Remark II.1, we have $P_{Y_1}(x) \geq P_{X_1}(x)$ and $P_{Y_2}(x) \geq P_{X_2}(x)$ for all x. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} P_{Y_1+Y_2}(z) &= \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} P_{Y_1}(z-x) dP_{Y_2}(x) \geq \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} P_{X_1}(z-x) dP_{Y_2}(x) \\ &= \iint_{x+y\leq z} dP_{X_1}(x) dP_{Y_2}(y) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} P_{Y_2}(z-y) dP_{X_1}(y) \\ &\geq \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} P_{X_2}(z-y) dP_{X_1}(y) = P_{X_1+X_2}(z). \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

□

A. Motivation

It is stated by Huber [4] that if the classes of distributions are constructed such that every distribution in the uncertainty class is absolutely continuous with respect to a dominating measure and the domain of the uncertainty classes are uncountably infinite, the stochastic boundedness property may fail. This property specifies minimax robustness in all Huber's papers [2], [3], [4] and it is a precondition for the design of minimax robust decentralized detection in [10]. This leads to the following questions:

1) Are there classes of distributions for which joint stochastic boundedness property fails?
2) Is minimax robust decentralized detection possible in this case?

In the sequel, two examples of uncertainty classes are provided, where the stochastic boundedness property holds and fails, respectively. For both examples, every distribution in the uncertainty classes is absolutely continuous with respect to the related nominal measure. The second question will be addressed starting from the next section.

Example II.3. *Let $P_0 = \mathcal{N}(t_l^0, \sigma^2)$ and $P_1 = \mathcal{N}(t_u^1, \sigma^2)$ be the nominal distributions and*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathscr{P}_0 &= \{Q_0 : Q_0 = \mathcal{N}(\mu_0, \sigma^2),\ \mu_0 \in [t_l^0, t_u^0]\}, \\ \mathscr{P}_1 &= \{Q_1 : Q_1 = \mathcal{N}(\mu_1, \sigma^2),\ \mu_1 \in [t_l^1, t_u^1]\}. \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

Then, $\hat{Q}_0 = \mathcal{N}(t_u^0, \sigma^2)$ and $\hat{Q}_1 = \mathcal{N}(t_l^1, \sigma^2)$ are the least favorable distributions satisfying the joint stochastic boundedness property

$$Q_0[\hat{l}(Y) \leq t] \geq \hat{Q}_0[\hat{l}(Y) \leq t], \ \ \forall t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \forall Q_0 \in \mathscr{P}_0 \tag{3}$$

$$Q_1[\hat{l}(Y) \leq t] \leq \hat{Q}_1[\hat{l}(Y) \leq t], \ \ \forall t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \forall Q_1 \in \mathscr{P}_1. \tag{4}$$

where $\hat{l} = d\hat{Q}_1/d\hat{Q}_0$ is the robust likelihood ratio function.

Proof. Since for

$$g(\mu_0, t) = \frac{\mu_0}{\sqrt{2}\sigma} - \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}\sigma}\left(t_u^0 + t_l^1 + \frac{2\sigma^2 t}{t_l^1 - t_u^0}\right)$$

we have

$$f(\mu_0, t) = Q_0[\log \hat{l}(Y) \leq t] = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_{g(\mu_0, t)}^{\infty} e^{-x^2} \mathrm{d}x \tag{5}$$

and

$$f(\mu_0 + \epsilon, t) - f(\mu_0, t) = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_{g(\mu_0, t)}^{g(\mu_0+\epsilon, t)} e^{-x^2} \mathrm{d}x \tag{6}$$

is decreasing in ϵ for every t, (3) holds. The proof for (4) is similar and is omitted. □

Example II.4. *The second example will be stated with the following proposition.*

Proposition II.5. *Let the uncertainty classes be*

$$\mathscr{P}_j = \{Q_j : D(Q_j, P_j) \leq \epsilon_j\}, \quad j \in \{0, 1\}, \tag{7}$$

where

$$D(Q_j, P_j) = \int_{\Omega} \ln(dQ_j/dP_j) \mathrm{d}Q_j, \quad j \in \{0, 1\}$$

is the KL-divergence. Then, there exists no pair of LFDs $(\hat{Q}_0, \hat{Q}_1)$ such that (3) *and* (4) *hold.*

Proof. The claim can be proven by contradiction. Assume that there exists such a pair of LFDs. Then, the same pair must satisfy

$$\hat{Q}_0 = \arg \max_{Q_0 \in \mathscr{P}_0} \mathrm{E}_{Q_0} \ln(d\hat{Q}_1/d\hat{Q}_0),$$

$$\hat{Q}_1 = \arg \min_{Q_1 \in \mathscr{P}_1} \mathrm{E}_{Q_1} \ln(d\hat{Q}_1/d\hat{Q}_0) \tag{8}$$

by applying Remark II.1 and Lemma II.1 in (3) and (4). By Huber and Strassen [4, Theorem 7.1], see also [17], (8) is equivalent to

$$\hat{Q}_0 = \arg \max_{Q_0 \in \mathscr{P}_0} \mathrm{E}_{Q_0} \ln(d\hat{Q}_1/dQ_0),$$
$$\hat{Q}_1 = \arg \min_{Q_1 \in \mathscr{P}_1} \mathrm{E}_{Q_1} \ln(dQ_1/d\hat{Q}_0). \tag{9}$$

By Dabak, [18], see also [1], the pair of distributions solving (9) are given by

$$\hat{q}_0 = \frac{{p_0}^{1-u} {p_1}^u}{\int_\Omega {p_0}^{1-u} {p_1}^u}, \quad \hat{q}_1 = \frac{{p_0}^v {p_1}^{1-v}}{\int_\Omega {p_0}^v {p_1}^{1-v}} \tag{10}$$

with respect to their density functions, where u and v are parameters to be determined such that

$$D(\hat{Q}_0, P_0) = \epsilon_0, \quad D(\hat{Q}_1, P_1) = \epsilon_1. \tag{11}$$

However, the test based on $\hat{l} = \hat{q}_1/\hat{q}_0$ is still a nominal likelihood ratio test [18], [1], though with a modified threshold, and therefore it is not minimax robust [19]. Hence, no pair of distributions is jointly stochastically bounded for the KL-divergence neighborhood. □

Notice that a minimax robust test for the KL-divergence exits and the corresponding test is unique and is randomized [20]. Since this test is not equivalent to any deterministic likelihood ratio test, it also does not satisfy (3) and (4).

B. Problem Definition

Consider a decentralized detection network with a parallel topology as shown in Figure 1. There are K decision makers observing a certain phenomenon, and a fusion center. All random variables Y_i corresponding to the observations y_i take values on a measurable space $(\Omega_i, \mathcal{A}_i)$ and are assumed to be independent under each hypothesis, but not necessarily identical. Every decision maker ϕ_i is assumed to be composed of two possibly random functions $\varphi_i : \Omega_i \to A_i$, where $A_i \in \mathcal{A}_i$ and $\vartheta_i : A_i \to S_i \subset \mathbb{N}$. Given an observation y_i, every sensor transmits its own decision $u_i = \phi_i(y_i) = \vartheta_i(\varphi_i(y_i))$ to the fusion center. The fusion center, i.e. γ then makes the final binary decision u_0 based on all decisions $u_1, \ldots, u_K$ that are received. The technical details related to the random variables Y_i, X_i and U_i corresponding to the observations y_i, x_i and u_i, respectively, which are shown in Figure 1, are detailed below:

- Under each hypothesis $\mathcal{H}_j$, the random variables Y_i^j, $X_i^j = \varphi_i(Y_i^j)$ and $U_i^j = \vartheta_i(\varphi(Y_i^j))$ follow the distributions $Q_j^{Y_i^j}$, $Q_j^{X_i^j}$ and $Q_j^{U_i^j}$ which belong to the uncertainty classes, $\mathscr{P}_j^{Y_i^j}$, $\mathscr{P}_j^{X_i^j}$ and $\mathscr{P}_j^{U_i^j}$, respectively. In order to avoid cumbersome notation, the distributions will



Fig. 1. Distributed detection network with K decision makers, each represented by the decision rule ϕ_i, which is the composition of two functions φ_i and ϑ_i, and a fusion center associated with the fusion rule γ.

be denoted by Q_0^i and Q_1^i, and the uncertainty classes by $\mathscr{P}_0^i$ and $\mathscr{P}_1^i$ omitting the random variables in superscripts.

- Similarly, the distributions $\mathbf{Q}_0 = (Q_0^1, \ldots, Q_0^K)$ and $\mathbf{Q}_1 = (Q_1^1, \ldots, Q_1^K)$ belong to the product uncertainty classes $\mathscr{P}_0 = \mathscr{P}_0^1 \times \ldots \times \mathscr{P}_0^K$ and $\mathscr{P}_1 = \mathscr{P}_1^1 \times \ldots \times \mathscr{P}_1^K$, respectively.
- $\mathbf{Y}^j = (Y_1^j, \ldots, Y_K^j)$, $\mathbf{X}^j = (X_1^j, \ldots, X_K^j)$ and $\mathbf{U}^j = (U_1^j, \ldots, U_K^j)$ are the multivariate random variables under the hypothesis $\mathcal{H}_j$, and $\mathbf{Y}$, $\mathbf{X}$ and $\mathbf{U}$ are defined similarly without the index j. The vector notation is also applied to the collection of decision rules $\boldsymbol{\phi} = (\phi_1, \ldots, \phi_K)$ where $\boldsymbol{\phi} \in \boldsymbol{\Delta} = \Delta_1 \times \ldots \times \Delta_K$.
- The stochastically larger sign $\succeq$ is extended to vector notation $\succeq$, e.g.,

$$\mathbf{U}^j \succeq \mathbf{U}^j \Longrightarrow U_i^j \succeq U_i^j, \quad \forall i.$$

and $\hat{(\cdot)}$ indicates the LFDs, e.g. $\hat{U}_i^j$ is the random variable U_i which follows $\hat{Q}_j$.

Moreover, the nominal and the robust likelihood ratio functions for each decision maker i are denoted by l_i and $\hat{l}_i$, respectively. Let the false alarm and miss detection probabilities be defined

as P_F and P_M. Then, the minimum error probability can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} P_E(\boldsymbol{\phi}, \gamma, \mathbf{Q}_0, \mathbf{Q}_1) =& P(\mathcal{H}_0)P_F(\boldsymbol{\phi}, \gamma, \mathbf{Q}_0) + P(\mathcal{H}_1)P_M(\boldsymbol{\phi}, \gamma, \mathbf{Q}_1) \\ =& P(\mathcal{H}_0) \int \gamma(\boldsymbol{\phi}(Y))\mathrm{d}\mathbf{Q}_0 + (1 - P(\mathcal{H}_0)) \int (1 - \gamma(\boldsymbol{\phi}(Y)))\mathrm{d}\mathbf{Q}_1 \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

where $t = P(\mathcal{H}_0)/P(\mathcal{H}_1)$ is the threshold. Accordingly, a solution to the following problem is seeked:

Problem II.1. *The minimax optimisation problem is stated as follows:*

$$\inf_{\boldsymbol{\phi}\in\boldsymbol{\Delta},\gamma} \sup_{(\mathbf{Q}_0,\mathbf{Q}_1)\in\mathscr{P}_0\times\mathscr{P}_1} P_E(\boldsymbol{\phi}, \gamma, \mathbf{Q}_0, \mathbf{Q}_1). \tag{13}$$

A solution to this problem results in the saddle value inequalities (see [10] for details):

$$P_E(\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_0, \hat{\mathbf{Q}}_1, \boldsymbol{\phi}, \gamma) \geq P_E(\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_0, \hat{\mathbf{Q}}_1, \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}, \hat{\gamma}) \geq P_E(\mathbf{Q}_0, \mathbf{Q}_1, \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}, \hat{\gamma}). \tag{14}$$

The left and the right inequalities indicate the minimisation and the maximisation defined in (13), respectively. The right inequality in (14) also implies

$$\begin{aligned} &P_F(\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_0, \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}, \hat{\gamma}) \geq P_F(\mathbf{Q}_0, \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}, \hat{\gamma}), \quad \forall \mathbf{Q}_0 \in \mathscr{P}_0 \\ &P_M(\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_1, \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}, \hat{\gamma}) \geq P_M(\mathbf{Q}_1, \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}, \hat{\gamma}), \quad \forall \mathbf{Q}_1 \in \mathscr{P}_1 \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

since P_E is distinct in $\mathbf{Q}_0$ and $\mathbf{Q}_1$. The converse is also true hence, (15) $\iff$ (14), if $\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}$ and $\hat{\gamma}$ jointly minimise P_E. The following section details the conditions that need to be satisfied by φ_i, ϑ_i and γ such that (14) holds, see Figure 1.

III. Minimax Robust Decentralized Detection

Error minimising decision rules $\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}$ and the fusion rule $\hat{\gamma}$ are known to be the likelihood ratio tests. The conditions that need to be satisfied for (15) to hold are twofold:

1) Conditions defined on $\mathbf{U}$ and from $\mathbf{U}$ to U_0 via the fusion rule γ.

2) Conditions defined from $\mathbf{Y}$ to $\mathbf{U}$ via φ_i and ϑ_i such that the conditions defined in 1) hold.

The following theorem details 1), whereas the next two theorems suggest two possible solutions for 2).

Theorem III.1. *The inequalities defined by* (15) *hold if* $\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}$ *results in*

1) $\hat{\mathbf{U}}^0 \succeq \mathbf{U}^0$ *and* $\mathbf{U}^1 \succeq \hat{\mathbf{U}}^1$,

2) $\hat{l}_i = \hat{q}_1^i/\hat{q}_0^i$ *is almost everywhere* $\mu = \hat{Q}_1^i + \hat{Q}_0^i$ *equal to a monotone non-decreasing function for every* i.

Proof: Since $U_1, \ldots, U_K$ are all mutually independent random variables, the optimum fusion rule $\hat{\gamma}$ at the fusion center is to make a decision based on

$$\hat{l}(\mathbf{U}) = \frac{\hat{q}_1(\mathbf{U})}{\hat{q}_0(\mathbf{U})} = \prod_{i=1}^{K} \frac{\hat{q}_1^i(U_i)}{\hat{q}_0^i(U_i)} \underset{\mathcal{H}_0}{\overset{\mathcal{H}_1}{\gtrless}} t$$

which is equivalent to

$$\log \hat{l}(\mathbf{U}) = \log \prod_{i=1}^{K} \frac{\hat{q}_1^i(U_i)}{\hat{q}_0^i(U_i)} = \sum_{i=1}^{K} \log \hat{l}_i(U_i) \underset{\mathcal{H}_0}{\overset{\mathcal{H}_1}{\gtrless}} t. \tag{16}$$

From condition 2), recall that $\hat{l}_i$ is monotone non-decreasing, $\log \hat{l}_i$ is also monotone non-decreasing for all i. Using Lemma II.1 in condition 1) with $\upsilon = \log \hat{l}_i$, all summands in (16) satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \log \hat{l}_i(\hat{U}_i^0) &\succeq \log \hat{l}_i\left(U_i^0\right), \quad \forall i, Q_0^i \in \mathscr{P}_0^i, \\ \log \hat{l}_i\left(U_i^1\right) &\succeq \log \hat{l}_i(\hat{U}_i^1), \quad \forall i, Q_1^i \in \mathscr{P}_1^i. \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

Accordingly, by applying Lemma II.2 to both inequalities in (17) inductively, i.e. to the pairs of random variables iteratively, leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{K} \log \hat{l}_i(\hat{U}_i^0) &\succeq \sum_{i=1}^{K} \log \hat{l}_i\left(U_i^0\right), \quad \forall Q_0^i \in \mathscr{P}_0^i, \\ \sum_{i=1}^{K} \log \hat{l}_i\left(U_i^1\right) &\succeq \sum_{i=1}^{K} \log \hat{l}_i(\hat{U}_i^1), \quad \forall Q_1^i \in \mathscr{P}_1^i. \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

Let $\hat{Q}_j$ and Q_j be the probability distributions of the random variable $\sum_{i=1}^{K} \log \hat{l}_i\left(U_i\right)$, when U_i is distributed as $\hat{Q}_j^i$ and Q_j^i, respectively. Then, the stochastic ordering stated by (18), cf. Remark II.1, leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{Q}_0\left[\sum_{i=1}^{K} \log \hat{l}_i\left(U_i\right) > t\right] &\geq Q_0\left[\sum_{i=1}^{K} \log \hat{l}_i\left(U_i\right) > t\right], \quad \forall t, Q_0, \\ \hat{Q}_1\left[\sum_{i=1}^{K} \log \hat{l}_i\left(U_i\right) \leq t\right] &\geq Q_1\left[\sum_{i=1}^{K} \log \hat{l}_i\left(U_i\right) \leq t\right], \quad \forall t, Q_1. \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

The inequalities in (19) imply the assertion, hence, the proof is complete. ■

The sufficient conditions amongst the random variables $U_1, \ldots, U_K$ as well as from $\mathbf{U}$ to U_0 have been established with Theorem III.1. Next, the sufficient conditions from $\mathbf{Y}$ to $\mathbf{U}$ will be stated with a suitable choice of the decision rules $\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}$, i.e. with φ_i and ϑ_i.

Theorem III.2. *If the function $\varphi_i : \Omega_i \to A_i$ with the mapping $Y_i \mapsto \hat{l}(Y_i)$ results in*

$$\hat{X}_i^0 \succeq X_i^0 \quad \textit{and} \quad X_i^1 \succeq \hat{X}_i^1, \quad \forall i, Q_j^i \in \mathscr{P}_j^i \tag{20}$$

and if ϑ_i is a monotone non-decreasing function,

$$U_i = \vartheta_i(X_i) = \begin{cases} 0, & X_i < t_0^i \\ d, & t_{d-1}^i \le X_i < t_d^i \\ D_i & X_i > t_{D_i-1} \end{cases}, \quad \forall d \in S_i = \{1, \ldots, D_i - 1\} \tag{21}$$

then, the two conditions described in Theorem III.1 hold and therefore all conclusions therein follow.

Proof. The mapping ϑ_i is monotone non-decreasing and from Lemma II.1, it follows that

$$\hat{U}_i^0 \succeq U_i^0 \quad \text{and} \quad U_i^1 \succeq \hat{U}_i^1, \quad \forall i, Q_j^i \in \mathscr{P}_j^i.$$

The function $\hat{l}_i = \hat{q}_1^i / \hat{q}_0^i$ is a.e. equal to a monotone non-decreasing function for all i as

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{l}_i(U_i = d) &= \frac{\hat{Q}_1^i[t_{d-1} \le X_i < t_d]}{\hat{Q}_0^i[t_{d-1} \le X_i < t_d]} \le \frac{\hat{Q}_1^i[t_d \le X_i < t_{d+1}]}{\hat{Q}_0^i[t_d \le X_i < t_{d+1}]} \\ &= \hat{l}_i(U_i = d+1) \end{aligned}$$

holds for all d, since

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\hat{Q}_1^i[t_{d-1} \le X_i < t_d]}{\hat{Q}_0^i[t_{d-1} \le X_i < t_d]} &= \frac{1}{\hat{Q}_0^i[t_{d-1} \le X_i < t_d]} \int_{\{t_{d-1} \le X_i < t_d\}} \mathrm{d}\hat{Q}_1^i \\ &= \frac{1}{\hat{Q}_0^i[t_{d-1} \le X_i < t_d]} \int_{\{t_{d-1} \le X_i < t_d\}} X_i \mathrm{d}\hat{Q}_0^i \\ &= \mathrm{E}_{\hat{Q}_0^i}[X_i | t_{d-1} \le X_i < t_d] \end{aligned}$$

is a number between t_{d-1} and t_d. Obviously, the result also applies to the end points, i.e. $\hat{l}_i(U_i = 0)$ and $\hat{l}_i(U_i = D_i)$, considering the intervals $(0, t_0^i)$ and (t_{D_i-1}, ∞), respectively. □

The results of Theorem III.2 can be extended to include non-monotone ϑ_i in case a well defined permutation function is applied at the fusion center. This is stated with the following corollary.

Corollary III.3. *Let ϑ_i be any bijective mapping from the set of non-overlapping intervals of A_i to the set S_i. Then, there exists a permutation mapping ϱ_i at the fusion center such that the two conditions described in Theorem III.1 hold and all conclusions therein follow.*

Proof. Since ϑ_i is a bijective mapping, the total number of intervals of A_i must have the same cardinality with the cardinality of S_i. Then, for every decision maker i, the fusion center employs a permutation mapping ϱ_i such that the fusion rule is equivalent to a monotone ϑ_i together with a regular likelihood ratio test at the fusion center. Hence, Theorem III.2 and accordingly Theorem III.1 follow. □

The task of fusion center is to employ an overall permutation mapping $\boldsymbol{\varrho} = \{\varrho_1, \ldots, \varrho_K\}$ to the received discrete multilevel decisions $u_1, \ldots, u_K$. The mapping described by ϱ_i is well known and can be found in [21, p. 310]. Notice that fusion center must know which decision corresponds to which decision maker to be able to perform this task.

The second possible design of $\boldsymbol{\phi}$ can be achieved through choosing φ_i as a trivial function and ϑ_i as a random function. The following theorem details this claim.

Theorem III.4. *Let φ_i be an identity mapping $Y_i \mapsto X_i$ and let the function $\vartheta_i : \Omega_i \to \{0, 1\}$ with the random mapping $\vartheta_i : X_i \mapsto U_i$ results in*

$$\hat{U}_i^0 \succeq U_i^0 \quad \textit{and} \quad U_i^1 \succeq \hat{U}_i^1 \quad \forall i, Q_j^i \in \mathscr{P}_j^i \tag{22}$$

which satisfies $\hat{q}_1^i(U_i = 0) + \hat{q}_0^i(U_i = 1) < 1$. Then, all conclusions of Theorem III.1 follow.

Proof. It is assumed by (22) that ϑ_i satisfies stochastic ordering condition imposed on U_i. What remains to be shown is that $\hat{l}_i$ is a.e. equal to a non-decreasing function. This condition is true because

$$\hat{q}_1^i(U_i = 0) < 1 - \hat{q}_0^i(U_i = 1) \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{q}_0^i(U_i = 1) < 1 - \hat{q}_{1,U_i}(U_i = 0), \quad \forall i$$

implies

$$\hat{q}_0^i(U_i = 1)\hat{q}_1^i(U_i = 0) < (1 - \hat{q}_0^i(U_i = 1))(1 - \hat{q}_1^i(U_i = 0)), \quad \forall i$$

which is

$$\hat{l}_i(U_i = 1) = \frac{1 - \hat{q}_1^i(U_i = 0)}{\hat{q}_0^i(U_i = 1)} > \frac{\hat{q}_1^i(U_i = 0)}{1 - \hat{q}_0^i(U_i = 1)} = \hat{l}_i(U_i = 0), \quad \forall i.$$

□

Both Theorem III.2 and Theorem III.4 imply Theorem III.1. From Theorem III.1 to the inequalities given by (14), what remains to be shown is that among all possible $\boldsymbol{\phi} \in \boldsymbol{\Delta}$, $\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}$ minimizes the overall error probability P_E. The problem definition is generic and depending on the choice of uncertainty classes $\mathscr{P}_0^i$ and $\mathscr{P}_1^i$ the decision and fusion rules, $\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}$ and $\hat{\gamma}$, may vary.

IV. EXAMPLES

As mentioned in the previous section, the choice of the uncertainty classes may lead to different types of minimax robust test. In this section, three different uncertainty classes are introduced, one of which makes use of Theorem III.2 and the other two Theorem III.4 such that together with $\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}$, which minimises P_E, imply the saddle value inequalities given by (14).

A. Huber's Extended Uncertainty Classes

Let us assume that $\mathscr{P}_0^i$ and $\mathscr{P}_1^i$ are given by Huber's extended uncertainty classes, cf. [3], [19, p. 271], which include various uncertainty classes as special cases such as $\epsilon-$contamination, total variation, Prohorov, Kolmogorov and Levy neighborhoods. For these uncertainty classes the stochastic ordering defined by (15) hold letting φ_i to be the robust likelihood ratio functions $\hat{l}_i$ obtained from the related uncertainty classes. Furthermore, if ϑ_is are monotone non-decreasing functions, or just bijective mappings, see Corollary III.3, Theorem III.2 follows. If additionally Y_i are mutually independent, the optimum mappings ϑ_i which minimize P_E are known to be the likelihood ratio tests [21]. Hence, Theorem III.2 and the saddle value condition (14) follow. This result was obtained previously by [10] under the assumption that the uncertainty classes satisfy joint stochastic boundedness property.

B. Uncertainty Classes Based on KL-divergence

The KL-divergence is a smooth distance and hence can be used to design minimax robust tests if the uncertainties are caused by modeling errors or model mismatch, cf. Proposition II.5, [22]. The general version of the minimax robust test based on the KL-divergence distance, which is called the (m)-test accepts user defined pair of robustness parameters (ϵ_0, ϵ_1) and the pair of nominal distributions (P_0, P_1) and gives a unique pair of least favorable density functions $(\hat{q}_0, \hat{q}_1)$ and a randomized robust decision rule $\hat{\phi}$ [20]. The robustness parameters should be chosen so that the hypotheses do not overlap, i.e. a minimax robust test exists. Existence of a minimax robust test implies $\hat{q}_1^i(U_i = 0) + \hat{q}_0^i(U_i = 1) < 1$ for every decision maker i. Moreover, the existence of a saddle value condition stated by [20] implies stochastic ordering of U_i, i.e. (22). Hence, by Theorem III.4, Theorem III.1 follows. Unlike Huber's minimax robust test, for the (m)-test the decision and fusion rules cannot be jointly minimised since $\hat{\phi}$ is unique and minimises the error probability of every decision maker P_{E_i}, not the global error probability P_E. Minimizing P_{E_i} for every decision maker does not guarantee that P_E is also minimised. However, there are special

cases, for which P_E is also minimised by $\hat{\phi}$. Assume that $\epsilon_0 = \epsilon_0^i$, $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon_1^i$ and $P_0 = P_0^i$, $P_1 = P_1^i$. Then, $\hat{\phi}$ will be composed of identical decision rules. For identical decision rules, there are also counterexamples showing that no fusion rule $\hat{\gamma}$ is a minimiser, because identical decision rules are not always optimum [23]. However, for the majority of decision making problems, i.e. for the choice of the probability distributions P_0 and P_1, identical decision makers are optimum and minimise P_E for some $\hat{\gamma}$. Similarly, if no assumption is made on the choice of the robustness parameters and the nominal distributions, there are some decision making problems for which P_E is minimised by $\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}$. This result together with Theorem III.1 implies the saddle value condition (14) and thus generalizes [10], which requires stochastic ordering of random variables X_i. Notice that since no other decision rules apart from $\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}$ are able to achieve the saddle value condition defined on $\boldsymbol{U}$, by Theorem III.1 no other decision rules can be minimax robust while minimising P_E either.

C. Uncertainty Classes Based on α-divergence

Similar to the KL-divergence, for the choice of $\alpha-$divergence, X_is are not jointly stochastically bounded, because minimax decision rules are randomised [24]. However, a minimax decentralized detection is possible with the same arguments stated in the previous section. The advantage of α-divergence over the KL-divergence is that both the distance, namely the parameter α, as well as the thresholds of the nominal test t can be chosen arbitrarily for every sensor i. This provides flexibility and a more likely scenario that the designed decision rules $\boldsymbol{\phi}$ minimise not only P_{E_i} but also P_E, hence they also imply the left inequality in (14). For both schemes, without imposing any additional constraints on the choice of the parameters or the nominal distributions, the right inequality in (14) is always satisfied. Therefore, the power of the test is guaranteed to be above a certain threshold, despite the uncertainty on the sensor network.

D. Composite Uncertainty Classes

The uncertainty classes for each decision maker can be chosen arbitrarily either from Huber's extended uncertainty classes or from the uncertainty classes formed with respect to the $\alpha-$divergence[1]. Based on the information from the previous sections, it can be concluded that the decentralized detection network is minimax robust, if the sensor and the fusion thresholds minimize the overall error probability P_E for the least favorable distributions $\hat{\boldsymbol{Q}}_{\mathbf{0}}$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{Q}}_{\mathbf{1}}$.

[1]As $\alpha \to 1$, the $\alpha-$divergence tends to the KL-divergence.

V. GENERALIZATIONS

A. Neyman-Pearson Formulation

The Neyman-Pearson (NP) version of the same problem can be stated as follows:

$$\inf_{\boldsymbol{\phi}\in\boldsymbol{\Phi},\gamma}\sup_{\boldsymbol{Q_1}\in\mathscr{P}_1} P_M(\boldsymbol{Q_1},\boldsymbol{\phi},\gamma) \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \sup_{\boldsymbol{Q_0}\in\mathscr{P}_0} P_F(\boldsymbol{Q_0},\boldsymbol{\phi},\gamma)\leq t. \tag{23}$$

If a pair of LFDs $(\hat{\boldsymbol{Q}}_{\boldsymbol{0}},\hat{\boldsymbol{Q}}_{\boldsymbol{1}})$ solves the maximisation of the Bayesian version of the minimax optimisation problem (13), it also solves the maximisation of its NP counterpart (23), because, the inequalities in (15) imply (23).

For the minimisation, dependently randomised decision and/or fusion rules may need to be employed at sensors, if the distribution of $\hat{l}_i(Y_i)$ has a jump discontinuity under $\mathcal{H}_0$ or $\mathcal{H}_1$, and at the fusion center, cf. [21], [6]. While randomisation may be allowed to solve (23) if Huber's uncertainty classes are considered, the same conclusion cannot be made thoroughly when the uncertainty classes are constructed based on the $\alpha-$divergence. In the latter case, dependently randomised decision rules may only be allowed at the fusion center but not at the decision makers, because the robust decision rules are unique and modifying them automatically results in the loss of saddle value inequalities (14), [17].

B. Repeated Observations

The proposed model includes the case, where one or more decision makers give their decisions based on a block of observations $\mathbf{y}_i=(y_i^1,\ldots,y_i^n)$, which are not necessarily obtained from identically distributed random variables $Y_i^1,\ldots,Y_i^n$. For every decision maker i, if the Huber's uncertainty classes are considered, it is known that the multiplication of the robust likelihood ratio functions also satisfies the minimax condition [2, p. 1756]. However, this is not true when the uncertainty classes are constructed for the α-divergence distance, cf. [20]. In this case, the minimax tests must be designed over multi-variate distribution functions.

C. Different Network Topologies

Among the network topologies, probably the parallel network topology has received the most attention in the literature [6]. However, depending on the application, decentralized detection networks can be designed considering a number of different topologies, for example a serial topology, a tree topology, or an arbitrary topology [21]. For arbitrary network topologies, it is

known that likelihood ratio tests are no longer optimal, in general [21, p. 331]. Therefore, the results obtained for a parallel network topology cannot be generalized to arbitrary networks in a straightforward manner. Each network structure requires a new and possibly much complicated design. In light of Theorem III.1, obtaining bounded error probability at the output of the fusion center is easier. Every sensor in the sensor network is required to transmit stochastically ordered decisions to its neighboring sensors and must make sure that the average error probability is less than $1/2$. This guarantees bounded error probability. Minimization of the global error probability P_E can be handled separately.

Asymptotically, i.e. when the number of sensors goes to infinity, P_E goes to zero if the network topology is parallel. This is a consequence of Cramer's Theorem [25] for Bernoulli random variables U_i. If the network of interest is a tandem network, the error probability is almost surely bounded away from zero if l_i for every sensor i is bounded under each hypothesis $\mathcal{H}_j$ [26], [27]. Remember that Huber's clipped likelihood ratio test bounds the nominal likelihoods, therefore, a minimax robust tandem network can never be asymptotically error free [12]. On the other hand, the minimax robust test based on the KL-divergence or α-divergence does not alter the boundedness properties of l_is, hence, preserves the asymptotic properties of the network.

VI. Conclusions

In this paper, minimax robust decentralized hypothesis testing has been studied for parallel sensor networks. It has been proven that the minimax robust tests designed from the KL-divergence neighborhood do not satisfy the joint stochastic boundedness property. This has motivated an attempt to prove whether minimax robust decentralized detection is possible in this case. The theory has been developed under the assumption that the random variables Y_i corresponding to the observations y_i are independent but not necessarily identical. Additionally, multi-level quantisation at decision makers was also allowed. Three examples of the proposed robust model has been provided. An extension of the proposed model to the Neyman-Pearson test, repeated observations, and different network topologies has been discussed. The proposed model generalizes [10] since stochastic boundedness property is not required at sensors and the sensors decision rules do not have to be monotone in order to achieve minimax robustness. This allows different types of minimax robust tests to be simultaneously employed by the decision makers, not only the clipped likelihood ratio tests.

The open problems arising from this work can be listed as follows:

- What are the minimax strategies for the sensor networks with arbitrary topologies, for which likelihood ratio test is known not to be optimum?
- How does the design, i.e. φ_i and ϑ_i should look like when Y_i are not mutually independent in order to guarantee bounded error probability?

REFERENCES

[1] B. C. Levy, *Principles of Signal Detection and Parameter Estimation*, 1st ed. Springer Publishing Company, Incorporated, 2008.

[2] P. J. Huber, "A robust version of the probability ratio test," *Ann. Math. Statist.*, vol. 36, pp. 1753–1758, 1965.

[3] ——, "Robust confidence limits," *Z. Wahrcheinlichkeitstheorie verw. Gebiete*, vol. 10, pp. 269–278, 1968.

[4] P. J. Huber and V. Strassen, "Minimax tests and the Neyman-Pearson lemma for capacities," *Ann. Statistics*, vol. 1, pp. 251–263, 1973.

[5] H. Chernoff, "A measure of asymptotic efficiency for tests of a hypothesis based on the sums of observations," *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, vol. 23, pp. 409–507, 1952.

[6] P. K. Varshney, *Distributed detection and data fusion*, 1st ed. Secaucus, NJ, USA: Springer-Verlag New York, Inc., 1996.

[7] E. Geroniotis, "Robust distributed discrete-time block and sequential detection," in *Proc. 1987 Conf. Inform. Sci. Syst.*, Johns Hopkins Univ.,Baltimore, MD, Mar. 1987, pp. 354–360.

[8] E. Geroniotis and Y. A. Chau, "On minimax robust data fusion," in *Proc. 1988 Conf. Inform. Sci. Syst.*, Princeton Univ., Princeton, NJ, Mar. 1988, pp. 876–881.

[9] E. Geraniotis, "Robust data fusion for multisensor detection systems," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 36, pp. 1265–1279, Nov 1990.

[10] V. V. Veeravalli, T. Basar and H. V. Poor, "Minimax robust decentralized detection," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 40, pp. 35–40, Jan 1994.

[11] K. Drakopoulos, A. Ozdaglar, and J. N. Tsitsiklis, "On learning with finite memory," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 59, no. 10, pp. 6859–6872, Oct 2013.

[12] J. Ho, W. P. Tay, T. Q. S. Quek, and E. K. P. Chong, "Robust decentralized detection and social learning in tandem networks," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 63, no. 19, pp. 5019–5032, Oct 2015.

[13] J. Park, G. Shevlyakov, and K. Kim, "Robust distributed detection with total power constraint in large wireless sensor networks," *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, pp. 2058–2062, 2011.

[14] G. Gül and A. M. Zoubir, "Robust detection under communication constraints," in *Proc. IEEE 14th Int. Workshop on Advances in Wireless Communications (SPAWC)*, Darmstadt, Germany, June 2013, pp. 410–414.

[15] S. Appadwedula, V. V. Veeravalli, and D. L. Jones, "Decentralized detection with censoring sensors." *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 56, no. 4, pp. 1362–1373, 2008.

[16] E. Wolfstetter, "Stochastic dominance: Theory and applications," 1996.

[17] G. Gül, *Robust and Distributed Hypothesis Testing*, 1st ed. Springer International Publishing, 2017.

[18] A. G. Dabak and D. H. Johnson, "Geometrically based robust detection," in *Proceedings of the Conference on Information Sciences and Systems*, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD, May 1994, pp. 73–77.

[19] P. J. Huber, *Robust statistics*. Wiley New York, 1981.

[20] G. Gül and A. M. Zoubir, "Minimax robust hypothesis testing," Feb. 2017, accepted for publication in *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*.

[21] J. N. Tsitsiklis, "Decentralized detection," in *In Advances in Statistical Signal Processing*. JAI Press, 1993, pp. 297–344.

[22] B. C. Levy, "Robust hypothesis testing with a relative entropy tolerance," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 55, no. 1, pp. 413–421, 2009.

[23] M. Cherikh and P. B. Kantor, "Counterexamples in distributed detection." *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 38, no. 1, pp. 162–165, 1992.

[24] G. Gül and A. M. Zoubir, "Robust hypothesis testing with α -divergence," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 64, no. 18, pp. 4737–4750, Sept 2016.

[25] H. Cramér, "Sur un nouveau théorème-limite de la théorie des probabilités," *Actualités Scientifiques et Industrielles*, no. 736:5-23, 1938.

[26] T. M. Cover, "Hypothesis testing with finite statistics," *Ann. Math. Statist.*, vol. 40, no. 3, pp. 828–835, 06 1969.

[27] M. E. Hellman and T. M. Cover, "Learning with finite memory," *Ann. Math. Statist.*, vol. 41, no. 3, pp. 765–782, 06 1970.